

This is what my friend, the minority leader, said in January of this year in praise of the conference committee:

If the Senate version is different than the one the House sends over, send it off to conference. That's how things are supposed to work around here. We used to call it legislating.

That is what the Republican leader said.

A few days later, Senator MCCONNELL extolled the virtue of regular order by saying this:

Remember, regular order is how the Senate is supposed to function. . . . The public is supposed to have a chance to scrutinize the proposals before us.

Here we have the junior Senator from Texas, the Speaker of the House, and the Republican leader saying we should have regular order. We should pass legislation, as we have done and the House has done, and then work it out in conference.

So we agree. I agree with those three people. Do you know something else. The American public agrees.

They suddenly don't like what they wished for. We passed our budget; the House Republicans passed theirs. The next step under regular order is to move to conference to negotiate a compromise.

I can't understand—maybe I do. I think I understand why Republicans don't want to debate their budget in the light of day.

You see, the Ryan budget, which they extol to each other, which passed the House, would turn Medicare into a voucher program—the end of Medicare as we know it.

The Ryan Republican budget would lower taxes for the rich while the middle class foots the bill. That is in their budget.

The Republican budget would rip the safety net from under the elderly, the middle class, veterans, and the poor. No wonder they don't want to go to conference. No wonder they don't want transparency.

The Democratic budget, by contrast, would preserve or protect Medicare for our children and grandchildren. The Democratic budget would ask the wealthiest Americans to contribute just a little bit more to help reduce the deficit. The Democratic budget would balance smart spending cuts with new revenue from closing loopholes.

It is obvious, then, why the Republicans don't want to compare the sensible Senate budget with the extreme House budget. The extreme House Republican budget was resoundingly rejected by the voters in November. That is what Governor Romney touted. Remember, Congressman RYAN was his Vice Presidential candidate. They ran together.

Now it is time for each side to stand for what it believes. As the junior Senator from Texas said late last year, we have "got to go on record and say this is what we want to do, this is our budget."

Democrats aren't afraid to debate our principles in the light of day. We

aren't afraid to try to resolve our differences in a conference committee instead of behind closed doors. This has been the custom in the Senate and House of Representatives for more than 200 years.

Why are Republicans so afraid? Why are they blocking us from continuing this process in public?

We heard from the junior Senator from Texas: Republicans will only go to conference if Democrats agree ahead of time to give in to every one of their demands. That is a strange one. Sure, we will go to conference, but before we go you have to agree to everything we want.

If Republicans can't rig the game in their favor, he said, there will be no game, no conference, no legislating at all. Democrats want to put deadline-day negotiations and last-minute fixes behind us. We want to engage in a responsible legislative process under regular order, and we will keep pushing the process forward. Passing a budget in each Chamber is a good step to restoring regular order. It is only a first step. The next step is to sit down and resolve our differences.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of Senator MCCONNELL, the Senate will be in morning business until 10 a.m. At 10 a.m., the Senate will recess until 11:30 to allow for the joint meeting of Congress with the President of the Republic of Korea. When the Senate reconvenes, we will resume consideration of S. 601, the Water Resources Development Act. At 2 p.m. there will be three rollcall votes in relation to amendments to the bill.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

WELCOMING THE PRESIDENT OF SOUTH KOREA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Later today we will welcome the President of the South Korea to address both Houses of Congress. President Park is a truly extraordinary woman, the first female chief executive of her country and, I might add, a conservative.

She is a strong leader too. I suppose that is because she endured so much in her own life; the assassination of her mother when she was only 22, the assassination of her father a few years after that, and the violent attack she herself endured in 2006.

Yet beyond a scar on her face, you would not know. She didn't recoil in fear. She threw herself right back into the rough and tumble of public life. So she is tough. I know this tenacious leader is committed to the United

States-South Korea alliance which is so important to both of our countries. The transition from her predecessor, President Lee, could not have been smoother. Both his administration and hers have been true partners, especially at a time of high contention.

We welcome President Park and look forward to hearing what she has to say later today.

NOMINATION OF THOMAS PEREZ

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this morning I would like to say a few words about the nomination of Thomas Perez as Labor Secretary.

The Perez nomination has generated a fair amount of controversy. For those who haven't tuned in yet to the debate surrounding his nomination, I would like to take a few minutes this morning to explain why.

The first thing to say about this nomination is that neither I nor anyone else on this side of the aisle has anything against Mr. Perez personally. As a graduate of Harvard Law School, there are a lot of things he could have done other than advocate for those struggling on the fringes of our society.

Yet when it comes to a vote such as this, we have to weigh a lot more than a nominee's intentions. We have to look at how those intentions square with the higher obligation that any nominee, but especially a Cabinet nominee, has to the rule of law. It is on this point where this nomination becomes so controversial and where the deference that Senators of both parties generally grant Presidents when it comes to picking Cabinet nominees begins to break down.

By all accounts, Tom Perez is not just a man with a heart for the poor, he is a committed ideologue who appears willing, quite frankly, to say or do anything to achieve his ideological end.

His willingness, time and again, to bend or ignore the law and misstate the facts in order to advance his far-left ideology leads me and others to conclude he would continue to do so if he were confirmed to another and much more consequential position of public trust.

Take, for instance, his efforts while on the Montgomery County Council to get Canadian drugs imported to the United States. According to the Washington Post, Perez tried to get the county to import these drugs even after—even after—a top FDA official said doing so would be, in his words, "undeniably illegal."

What was Perez's response? "Federal law is muddled," he said at the time. "Sometimes you have to push the envelope."

Think about that statement. "Sometimes you have to push the envelope." Is that the kind of approach to Federal law we want in those we confirm to run Federal agencies? Folks who think if a Federal law is inconvenient to their ends they can simply characterize it as